DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 255 TM 840 598

AUTHOR Knight, G. Diane; And Others
TITLE Measuring the Attitudes of Adults toward Children. Research Report #4-84.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adults; *Attitude Measures; Attitudes; *Children; Interpersonal Relationship; Negative Attitudes; Rating Scales; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Situational Attitude Scale (Adults Children); *Social Distance

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop an attitude scale based on the theory of social distance that could assess attitudes toward children under the age of 12. The questions asked were: Are attitudes of adults toward children positive, negative, or neutral? Do such attitudes have a potency and activity dimension as well as an evaluative one? Do attitudes toward children differ depending on the degree of social distance reflected in the situations in which children are experienced? Do the attitudes of males and females differ toward children? A Situational Attitude Scale - Adults/Children (SAS-A/C) was developed which presented subjects with ten social situations reflecting varying degrees of social distance, and asked them to respond to ten bipolar adjectives for each situation. Findings indicated that adults do hold negative attitudes toward children, especially when placed in social situations reflecting greater social proximity. Although attitudes did differ along the potency and activity dimensions, greater differences were found along the evaluative dimension. Attitudes of males and females were not found to be different. Results are discussed as being consistent with other research on bias toward non-cohort groups. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249255

COUNSELING CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

MEASURING THE ATTITUDES OF ADULTS TOWARD CHILDREN

G. Diane Knight, Carol Seefeldt, and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 4-84

TM 840 548

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Sedlacek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

MEASURING THE ATTITUDES OF ADULTS TOWARD CHILDREN

G. Diane Knight, Carol Seefeldt, and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 4-84

Computer time for this project has been provided in full through the Computer Science Center of the University of Maryland, College Park.

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

Measuring the Attitudes of Adults Toward Children

G. Diane Knight, Carol Seefeldt and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 4-84

SUMMARY

Public policy today seems to adversely affect children as a group even though a cursory examination of adult behavior toward children suggests at least ambivalent attitudes. The purpose of this study was to develop an attitude scale based on the theory of social distance that could assess attitudes toward children under the age of 12. The questions asked were" Are attitudes of adults toward children positive, negative, or neutral? Do such attitudes have a potency and acticity dimension as well as an evaluative one? Do attitudes toward children differ depending on the degree of social distance reflected in the situations in which children are experienced? Do the attitudes of males and females differ toward children?

A Situational Attitude Scale - Adults/Children (SAS-A/C) was developed which presented subjects with ten social situations reflecting varying degrees of social distance, and asked them to respond to ten bipolar adjectives for each situation. Findings indicated that adults do hold negative attitudes toward children, especially when placed in social situations reflecting greater social proximity. Although attitudes did differ along the potency and activity dimensions, greater differences were found along the evaluative dimension. Attitudes of males and females were not found to be different. Results are discussed as being consistent with other research on bias toward non-cohort groups.

Children, who can't speak for themselves, articulate their own needs, vote or lobby, must depend on adults to establish social policies that protect their total well being. Public policy today seems to affect our nation's children adversely. For instance, children as a group were among the first to experience the impact of federal budget cuts (Children's Defense Fund, 1983). Such matters of public policy appear to reflect negative attitudes, even though an examination of our nation's behavior toward children seems at least ambiguous.

On the one hand, children are lavished with love and care, pampered and protected, declared a precious resource and a national treasure. We focus attention on our children, extravagently giving them expensive toys, computer games, recreational facilities and clothes. In addition to spending a great deal of money for children's amusement and entertainment, adults seem to care about the welfare of children. More books are published on childrearing today than at any other time in our history (Klausner, 1968), suggesting attitudes toward children that are positive, and behaviors directed toward the promotion of children's entertainment and welfare.

At the same time, adults behave negatively toward children in several ways. Holt (1974) has suggested that children could qualify for minority status in our culture. Children are banned from at least a quarter of all rental housing, as well as from many adult recreational and residential neighborhoods. Children often are not invited, nor welcome, to attend the social functions that transmit our culture such as weddings, funerals, dinner parties, plays, concerts, and other social gatherings. On this personal-social level, adults behave as if they wish to keep a modicum of social distance between themselves and children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Adults even behave as if childhood itself were something to be avoided, or at least shortened. Elkind (1982) points to this cultural attitude when he states, "we dress children in miniature adult costumes, often with designer labels, we expose them to gratuitous sex and violence and we ask them to cope with an increasingly bewildering environment. Children are constantly being hurried. By hurrying children to grow up, or by treating them as adults, we hope to remove a portion of our own burden" (p. 4).

The question of what attitudes adults hold toward children cannot be answered by observing the behavior of adults in our culture. Nor does the research literature offer a clear answer to the question of adult attitudes toward children. Research on adult attitudes toward children is concentrated around three concerns: 1) attitudes of the elderly toward children (Seefeldt & Jantz, 1979; Cryns & Monk, 1972; Higgens & Faunce, 1977), 2) attitudes of teachers toward their pupils (Khan & Weiss, 1973), and 3) attitudes of parents toward their children (Sears, Macoby & Levin, 1957) or toward child-rearing (Cohen & Eiduson, 1973). These areas of research focus on specific adult-child interactions, and do not provide a picture of the more general underlying attitudes of adults toward children in our nation, whether positive or negative.

Children, like any other group in our society, are likely to be stereotyped on the basis of age, with adult attitudes reflecting some of the same biases that have been found to exist on the basis of sex, race, ethnic or religious identification. Riley, Johnson, & Foner (1972), suggest that the phenomenon of cohort-centrism -- the tendency of individuals to view age cohorts in terms of their own particular cohort and to manifest negative attitudes toward people in age groups different from their own -- may be applicable to children as a group, resulting in stereotyping on the basis of

age. There is ample evidence of bias toward other age groups in literature. Research has shown age bias among college students toward older students (Peabody & Sedlacek, 1982), and of college student personnel professionals and educational professionals toward "older" adults (Celio, Sedlacek, & Scholssberg, 1977). Attitudes of adults, children and others toward the elderly have also shown age bias (Jantz, Seefeldt, Galper, & Serock, 1976; Thomas & Yamamota, 1975). Studies of intergenerational attitudes not only have shown groups to be viewed differently because of age (Kidwell & Booth, 1977), they have also shown the attitudes of one age group toward another modified by such variables as life satisfaction and filial relationships (Cryns & Monk, 1972), and related to the perception of social distance (Kidwell & Booth, 1977).

If attitudes do, in fact, direct behavior (Bagozzi, 1981), then assessing the attitudes of adults toward children in our nation could lead to a clearer understanding of adult behavior that seems at least ambivalent. The purpose of this study was to develop an attitude scale based on the theory of social distance to assess the attitudes of adults toward children under the age of 12. The questions asked were: 1) Are attitudes toward children positive, negative, or neutral? 2) Do such attitudes have a potency and activity dimension as well as an evaluative one? 3) Do attitudes toward children differ depending upon the degree of social distance in the situations in which children are experienced? 4) Do the attitudes of males and females toward children differ?

Procedures

Development of the Instrument

A Situational Attitude Scale - Adults/Children (SAS-A/C) was developed to assess the attitudes of adults toward children under the age of 12. The

SAS methodology was originally designed to measure the degree of prejudice one racial groups holds toward another (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1970). The methodology presented subjects with ten social situations which reflected varying degrees of social distance, and asked them to respond to ten bipolar pairs of adjectives for each situation. The procedure seemed to limit psychological withdrawal and made it more difficult to respond with the socially desirable attitude.

The development of the SAS-A/C was accomplished in two parts. First, situations in which adults might experience children in either positive or negative ways were generated by asking 100 adult graduate students at a large eastern university to suggest situations in which "children have really bugged you" and situations in which "you have really enjoyed being with children." Twenty situations were chosen from those most frequently cited in the pool of possible social situations. Second, these 20 situations were assessed for degree of social distance, using a method similar to that used by Bogardus (1933). Bogardus defined social distance as the "degree of sympathetic understanding between two people, or between a person and a group -- personal distance or personal-group distance" (1933:268). Subjects responded to his original scale by indicating agreement with statements suggesting minimal through maximal distance. In a similar fashion, 85 adult students attending one of two community college night classes were asked to rate each of the 20 situations "according to how close or distant you would have to feel to that person to make the statement about him or her." They rated a situation "1" if they had to feel extremely close to a person to make the statement about the person; rated it "5" if they could make the statement without knowing him or her at all; rated it "3" if they had to know the person fairly well.

A mean and standard deviation was computed on the ratings for each statement. Means ranged from 1.19 to 4.32 for the 20 situations. In order to obtain 10 situations which represented the continuum of social distance, two criteria were used. First, situations were chosen whose means were closest to the five interval points of the scale. That is, means near 1, 2, 3, 4, & 5 were chosen. These situations were: 1) would sit next to him/her on an airplane; 2) would have dinner at a nice restaurant with him/her; 3) would attend a movie with him/her; 4) would rent a room to him/her; and 5) would have him/her as a guest in my home for a week. Second, five additional situations were chosen which had means between the intervals of the scale, which had the lowest standard deviations, and which represented a variety of situational content. The situations chosen meeting these criteria were: 1) would attend a church ice cream social where he/she was present; 2) would have him/her move into my neighborhood; 3) would have him/her unexpectedly accompany a coworker I had invited to my home for coffee; 4) would walk in a local park where he/she was present; and 5) would have him/her live in the apartment next to mine. The means and standard deviations for social distance for the 10 situations selected are shown in Table 1.

For each of the 10 situations chosen, 10 bipolar scales representing three dimensions of semantic meaning -- evaluation, potency, and activity -- were written, using those adjectives suggested by Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum (1957), making a total of 100 items on the SAS-A/C. The positive pole for each of these semantic differentials (SD) was randomly varied from left to right to avoid response set. The final forms of the SAS-A/C consisted of identical instructions, social situations, and bipolar scales. On Form A

the person in the situation was not designated. However, on Form B the person in the situation was designated as a child or children under the age of 12. Instructions and situations for both forms are shown in Exhibit 1.

Administration of the SAS-A/C

The two forms of the SAS-A/C were randomly ordered and administered to adults attending 8 evening classes at the adult education division of a large eastern university. The administrator, an adult white male, read the directions to the group and answered questions with noncommital responses such as "do the best you can." Responses were anonymous, and administration required less than 20 minutes.

Sample

The sample consisted of 146 adults. Incomplete data resulted in 138 useable questionnaires, 68 of the neutral A form and 70 of the experimental B form. The sample was 43% female and 57% male, and primarily white (72%).

Composed of young adults (42% age 25 or younger, 46% age 26-35, and 12% over age 26), the majority of the sample (68%) reported having 12-16 years of education. Although the sample was over the age of 21, fewer than 34% were presently married, and 55% reported never having been married. Of those reporting being married, 48% had been married for fewer than five years, 28% from 6 to 10 years, and only 25% had been married 11 years or more.

Infrequent contact with children was reported by the sample. Only 23% of the sample reported having children, and most reported having either infrequent or no contact with children (15% several time a month, 25% several time a year, 11% no contact).

Results

Data were anaylzed by two-way analysis of variance, with form and sex as main effects. Results indicated that 28 items were significantly different on form, 5 on sex, and 6 on the interaction of form and sex. As nine out of 100 items would be expected to show significant results at the .05 level (Sakoda, Cohen & Beall, 1954), the results indicated that main effects for form were significantly above chance level. Sex and interaction effects, however, were not. Table 2 shows the mean ratings and standard deviations by form which reflected differences in attitudes towards children.

In nine of the 10 social situations, attitudes were significantly different when children were present. The only situation that did not produce differences on form was situation VI: "You have invited a co-worker to your house for coffee and she/he unexpectedly brings her/his 6 year old child."

The evaluative dimension of the SD produced the most significant differences, with 20 of the evaluative dimension items resulting in less favorable attitudes toward children. Only 5 items on the potency dimension and 3 items on the activity dimension produced significant differences by form.

Situations representing close social proximity, such as renting a room in one's house (Situation VII), and visiting houseguests (Situation IX) were most likely to be viewed as negative on the evaluative dimension, with respondents rating these with significantly greater disapproval, unwillingness, discomfort, and unfriendliness when small children were included. Situation VIII, sitting next to someone on a plane traveling

nonstop across country, was the only situation ranked as socially distant during scale construction that produced significantly less favorable attitudes when a child was present. That situation with a child present was rated as more painful, bad, unwilling, and unsociable on the evaluative items of the SD.

Social situations ranked as being of moderate or greater social distance were also viewed less positively on the evaluative dimension of the SD items when children were involved. Attending a movie with children was rated as sad and with disapproval, and living in an apartment next to children, as well as having a family with children move into your neighborhood, were rated as significantly more sociable and unfriendly than when children were not included. Nevertheless, situations ranked of moderate or greater social distance did not produce as many negative responses as those representing close social proximity.

Situations also differed along the activity and potency dimensions when children were included. An ice cream social with small children present was more likely to be rated on the activity and potency dimension as emotional and large respectively. Dinner at a nice restaurant was rated on the activity dimension as more active, as well as negative and unfriendly on the evaluative dimension. Both having a child live in an apartment next door and having preschoolers for houseguests were considered "serious" situations.

Discussion

The results of this study indicated that adults do hold negative attitudes toward children and wish to keep at least a modicum of social distance between themselves and children. Situations which reflected

greater social proximity were those that tended to generate more negative attitudes toward children, suggesting that relationships between adults and children are, in fact, characterized by a degree of social distance.

These results were consistent with other research using the SAS methodology to assess racial attitudes (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1970; 1972; Minatoya & Sedlacek, in press), sexist attitudes (Minatoya & Sedlacek, 1983), ageism (Peabody & Sedlacek, 1982), and attitudes toward physical disabilities (Stovall & Sedlacek, 1983). These studies also found situations of greater social proximity to generate more negative attitudes.

Although Situation VIII, sitting next to someone on a plane nonstop across country, was rated as socially distant when presented in neutral form, it may have represented close social proximity when a child was present since children would be more likely to invade the social space of those around them, while an adult would be expected to respect the social distance inherent in an impersonal situation such as flying on a airplane.

To some extent the desire to avoid socially close situations with children was further confirmed by this sample's limited contact with children in their day to day lives. Although the sample was of traditional child-rearing age, the fact that the adults in this sample were predominantly white, educated, unmarried, and childless may have contributed to the results. Since the variable of contact has been found to moderate attitudes toward other groups (Kidwell & Booth, 1977) future research using the SAS-A/C should control for amount, type and degree of contact with children under the age of 12, and determine the extent to which attitudes are moderated by contact and contact is moderated by attitudes. A larger and more varied sample of adults would allow for those kinds of comparisons.

The strength of the negative attitudes was also striking. Of the 28 significantly different items, 20 were on the evaluative dimension. Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum (1957) found that when the sample of stimuli being judged was restricted in some way, in this case to situations involving children, the judgments tended to coalesce into a single factor. They suggested that this tended to happen when concepts being judged were more emotionally or attitudinally loaded. The items of the SD from the evaluative dimension tended to reflect this kind of emotion laden attitude. Future versions of the SAS-A/C might well be limited to this evaluative dimension.

Other revisions of the SAS-A/C might also be necessary if future research is to be undertaken with it. Situation VI, inviting a coworker to one's home who unexpectedly brings a child, failed to differentiate either by form or by sex, and should be replaced.

Although there are limitations to the results of this study, some conclusions can be made. This study provides some evidence of negative attitudes among young adults, and attitudes that are related to situations in which children would be in social proximity. That young adults hold such negative attitudes and want to distance themselves from children would certainly have implications for future social policy regarding children. If such attitudes hold for more varied groups of adults, children might certainly be viewed among other minority groups, subject to the same bias suffered by such groups, but powerless by virtue of their age to protect or advocate for themselves. It becomes more and more important for those who highly value our children to address these attitudes, not only in terms of social policy, but also on the personal-social level where children are experienced in intimate social situations.

References

Bagozzi, R.P. (1981). Attitudes, intentions, and behavior: A test of some key hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41 (4), 607-628.

Bogardus, E.S. (1933). A social distance scale. Sociology and Social Research, 17, 265-271.

Children's Defense Fund (1983). A children's defense budget: An analysis of the president's FY 1984 budget and children. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund.

Celio, M.B., Sedlacek, W.E., & Schlossberg, N.K. (1977). The development of a measure of attitudes toward age. Counseling Center Research Report #8-77, College Park, Md.: University of Maryland.

Cohen, J. & Eiduson, B.T. (1973). Changing patterns of child rearing in alternative lifestyles: Implications for development. In A. Davids (Ed.), Child personality and psychopathology: Current topics. New York: John Wiley.

Cryns, A.G. & Monk, A. (1972). Attitudes of the aged toward the young: A multivariate study in intergenerational perception. Journal of Gerontology, 27 (1), 107-112.

Elkind, D. (1982). The hurried child. New York: McMillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Higgens, P.S. & Faunce, R. (1977). Attitudes of Minneapolis elementary school students and senior citizens toward each other. ERIC 139834.

Holt, J. (1974). Escape from childhood. New York: Ballantine Press.

Jantz, R.K., Seefeldt, C., Galper, A., & Serock, K. (1976). Children's attitudes toward the elderly. Unpublished report. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland.

Kidwell, I.J. & Booth, A. (1977). Social distance and intergenerational relations. The Gerontologist, 17 (5), 412-420.

Khan, S.B. & Weiss, J. (1973). The teaching of affective responses. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.) Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Klausner, S.Z. (1968). Two centuries of child-rearing manuals. Washington, D.C.: The Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, Inc.

Minatoya, L.Y. & Sedlacek, W.E. (in press). Assessing attitudes of white university students toward blacks in a changing context. Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance.

Minatoya, L.Y. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1983). The Situational Attitude Scale for Women (SASW): A means to measure environmental sexism. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 47 (1), 26-30.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.

Peabody, S.A. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1982). Attitudes of younger university students toward older students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23, 140-143.

Riley, M.W., Johnson, M., & Foner, A. (1972). Aging and society: Vol: III: A sociology of age stratification. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sakoda, J.M., Cohen, B.H., & Beall, G. (1954). Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. Psychological Bulletin, 51, 172-175.

Sears, R., Macoby, E., & Levin, H. (1957). Patterns of child rearing. Evans, Ind.: Row, Paterson.

Sedlacek, W.E. & Brooks, G.C., Jr. (1970). The development of a measure of racial attitudes. Psychological Reports, 27, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W.E. & Brooks, G.C., Jr. (1972). The situational attitude scale (SAS) manual. Chicago: Natresources, Inc.

Seefeldt, C. & Jantz, R.K. (1979). Elderly person's attitudes toward children. Unpublished report. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland.

Stovall, C. & Sedlacek, W.E. (1983). Attitudes of male and female university students toward students with different physical disabilities. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24 (4), 325-330.

Thomas, E.C. & Yamamota, K. (1975). Attitudes toward age: An exploration in school age children. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 6, 117-129.

Table 1

RATINGS OF SITUATIONS FOR SOCIAL DISTANCE *

Situation		Mean	S.D.
IX	would have him/her as a guest in my home for a week	1.91	1.19
VII	would rent a room in my home to him/her	1.92	1.12
VI	would have him/her unexpectedly accompany a co-worker I had invited to my home for coffee	2.92	1.36
I	would attend a movie with him/her	3.09	.89
V	would have him/her live in the apartment next to mine	3.79	1.33
II	would walk in a local park where he/she was present	3.88	1.27
IV	would have dinner at a nice restaurant where he/she was present	4.01	1.27
X	would have him/her move into my neighborhood	4.13	1.26
III	would attend a church ice cream social where he/she was present	4.18	1.18
VIII	would sit next to him/her on an airplane flying non-stop from Washington, D.C. to San Francisco	4.32	1.28

* Subjects rated each statement "according to how close or distant you would have to feel to a person to make the statement about him or her." Statements were rated on a 5-point scale where statement was rated '1' if they had to feel extremely close to a person to make the statement about that person; rated '5' if they could make the statement about the person without knowing him or her at all; rated it '3' if they had to know the person fairly well.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations by Form

Item #	Situations and Bipolar Adjectives	Neutral Form (A) Mean	SD	Child Form (B) Mean	SD
	Situation I: attending a movie **				
1.	happy - sad*	1.78	.90	2.14	1.09
2.	strong - weak	1.88	.61	1.80	.84
3.	unfriendly - friendly	2.18	1.00	2.21	1.17
4.	difficult - easy	2.43	.97	2.21	1.13
5.	painful - pleasurable	2.46	.90	2.16	1.09
6.	active - passive	2.18	1.09	1.87	1.09
7.	soft - hard	1.94	.77	2.11	.94
8.	unintentional - intentional	1.97	.90	1.93	.94
9.	heavy - light	2.04	.70	1.94	1.22
10.	approving - disapproving*	1.57	1.11	1.97	1.22
	Situation II: walk in the park				
11.	fast - slow	1.78	1.02	2.13	1.23
12.	approving - disapproving	.85	.87	.80	.89
13.	dirty - clean	2.34	1.00	2.59	1.03
14.	deliberate - impulsive	2.38	.86	2.24	1.03
15.	friendly - unfriendly	.88	.89	.89	.99
16.	brave - cowardly	1.53	.84	1.47	.83
17.	passive - active	2.50	1.22	2.43	1.20
18.	soft - hard*	2.01	.87	1.53	.99
19.	strong - weak	1.46	.87	1.43	1.01
20.	ugly - beautiful	2.65	.84	2.89	.96
	Situation III: ice cream social				
21.	sociable - unsociable	1.28	1.13	1.73	1.41
22.	emotional - unemotional*	1.66	.89	1.40	.87
23.	yielding - tenacious	1.84	1.00	1.81	1.03
24.	sad - happy	2.51	1.07	2.36	1.09
25.	active - passive	1.54	1.11	1.56	.97
26.	small - large*	1.94	1.02	2.46	1.14
27.	important - unimportant	1.91	1.12	1.87	.98
28.	fast - slow	1.79	.99	1.77	.92
29.	pleasureable - painful	1.44	1.11	1.60	1.07
30.	heavy - light	1.82	.85	2.00	.93

* Differences by form significant at $p < .05$ using ANOVA.
** Complete situations described in Exhibit 1.

Table 2 (cont.)

Means and Standard Deviations by Form

Item #	Situation and Bipolar Adjectives	Neutral Form (A) Mean	Neutral Form (A) SD	Child Form (B) Mean	Child Form (B) SD
	Situation IV: nice restaurant				
31.	friendly - unfriendly*	1.40	1.07	1.93	1.45
32.	passive - active*	1.68	.97	2.16	1.06
33.	tough - fragile	1.93	.55	1.87	.83
34.	negative - positive*	2.31	1.03	1.94	1.32
35.	long - short	2.00	.52	1.91	.79
36.	deliberate - impulsive	1.85	.70	1.74	1.00
37.	superior - inferior	1.81	.58	1.86	.73
38.	weak - strong	2.28	.64	2.29	.80
39.	intentional - unintentional	1.88	.76	1.74	.88
40.	comfortable - uncomfortable	1.63	1.17	2.03	1.39
	Situation V: apartment next door				
41.	fast - slow	1.68	.84	1.84	.75
42.	humorous - serious*	1.85	.93	2.00	1.10
43.	willing - unwilling	1.47	.97	1.87	1.12
44.	bad - good	2.47	.91	2.13	1.08
45.	strong - weak	1.65	.69	1.66	.78
46.	active - passive	1.38	.85	1.59	.88
47.	friendly - unfriendly*	1.00	.93	1.36	1.18
48.	small - large	2.04	.68	1.97	.78
49.	hot - cold	1.90	.58	2.00	.72
50.	unsociable - sociable*	2.82	1.02	2.37	1.25
	Situation VI: coffee with coworker				
51.	comfortable - uncomfortable	1.85	1.26	2.00	1.34
52.	short - long	1.91	.73	2.07	.82
53.	pessimistic - optimistic	2.29	.96	2.01	1.17
54.	heavy - light	1.90	.63	1.96	.88
55.	impulsive - deliberate	1.91	.97	2.11	.93
56.	good - bad	1.65	1.00	1.94	1.10
57.	passive - active	2.46	.82	2.47	.85
58.	negative - positive	2.19	.93	1.96	1.18
59.	hard - soft	2.09	.64	1.86	.91
60.	intentional - unintentional	1.66	.86	1.67	.85

* Differences by form significant at $p < .05$ using ANOVA.
** Complete situations described in Exhibit 1.

Table 2 (cont)

Means and Standard Deviations by Form

Item #	Situations and Bipolar Adjectives	Neutral Form (A) Mean	SD	Child Form (B) Mean	SD
	Situation VII: rent a room				
61.	willing - unwilling*	1.25	.98	2.51	1.40
62.	slow - fast	2.00	.79	2.24	.89
63.	weak - strong	2.38	.93	2.53	.94
64.	serious - humorous	1.56	1.19	1.27	.99
65.	disapproving - approving*	2.24	.93	1.56	1.21
66.	friendly - unfriendly*	1.03	.88	1.77	1.25
67.	intentional - unintentional	1.38	.99	1.26	.83
68.	small - large	2.16	.78	2.20	.79
69.	active - passive	1.31	.92	1.29	.76
70.	comfortable - uncomfortable*	1.51	1.10	2.24	1.21
	Situation VIII: airplane trip				
71.	pleasureable - painful*	1.51	.92	2.06	1.32
72.	simple - complex	1.88	.97	2.11	1.03
73.	humorous - serious	1.66	.89	1.86	1.05
74.	bad - good*	2.41	.90	1.89	1.15
75.	sort - long	2.06	.84	2.34	.90
76.	heavy - light	1.91	.82	1.69	.91
77.	intentional - unintentional	1.74	.97	1.66	.78
78.	unwilling - willing*	2.44	.92	1.94	1.19
79.	sociable - unsociable*	1.26	.89	1.87	1.30
80.	active - passive	1.71	.96	1.17	1.05
	Situation IX: visiting friends				
81.	approving - disapproving*	.68	.80	1.81	1.29
82.	small - large	2.12	.70	2.19	.80
83.	unwilling - willing*	2.99	.94	2.06	.80
84.	weak - strong*	2.62	.90	2.20	.84
85.	intentional - unintentional	1.44	.87	1.74	.94
86.	friendly unfriendly*	.65	.77	1.74	.94
87.	slow - fast	2.38	.79	2.11	.94
88.	humorous - serious*	1.21	.94	1.97	1.05
89.	uncomfortable - comfortable*	3.06	.96	2.07	1.22
90.	active - passive*	1.18	.99	1.59	.89

* Differences by form significant at $p < .05$ using ANOVA.
** Complete situations described in Exhibit 1.

Table 2 (cont)

Means and Standard Deviations by Form

Item #	Situations and Bipolar Adjectives	Neutral Form (A) Mean	SD	Child Form (B) Mean	SD
	Situation X: move into neighborhood				
91.	intentional - unintentional	1.65	.93	1.83	1.05
92.	bad - good	2.53	.78	2.23	1.12
93.	approving - unapproving	1.29	.81	1.59	1.23
94.	serious - humorous	2.18	.71	1.96	1.01
95.	passive - active	2.19	.86	2.26	.76
96.	large - small	1.93	.61	1.77	.75
97.	unsociable - sociable*	2.84	.78	2.30	1.21
98.	weak - strong	2.26	.61	2.33	.74
99.	comfortable - uncomfortable*	1.25	.92	1.71	1.17
100.	fast slow	1.90	.63	1.83	.76

N=138

* Differences by form significant at p .05 using ANOVA.
** Complete situations described in Exhibit 1.

Instructions and Situations from the Situational Attitude Scale - Adult/Children (SAS-A/C)

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous so, please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out to dinner.

happy ' A ' B ' C ' D ' E ' sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings, e.g., you might select "B" on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you may feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

FORM A	FORM B
I. You attend an early movie with friends and find the first rows of the theatre filled.	I. You attend an early movie with friends and find the first rows of the theatre filled by members of a cub scout troup.
II. You are taking an afternoon walk at a local park where a group is playing with a ball.	II. You are taking an afternoon walk at a local park where a group of preschool children are playing with a ball.
III. The ice cream social you are attending is crowded.	III. The ice cream social you are attending is crowded with preschool children.
IV. You are having dinner at a nice restaurant when the hostess seats a couple nearby.	IV. You are having dinner at a nice restaurant when the hostess seats a couple with a two year old child nearby.

SITUATIONS (cont.)

FORM A	FORM B
V. A person moves into the apartment next to yours.	V. A person with a three year old child moves into the apartment next to yours.
VI. You have invited a coworker to your house for coffee and he/she unexpectedly brings someone.	VI. You have invited a coworker to your house for coffee and he/she unexpectedly brings his/her 6 year old child.
VII. You are looking for someone to rent a room in your home. A person comes to look at it.	VII. You are looking for someone to rent a room in your home. A person with a 7 year old child comes to look at it.
VIII. You are on an airplane flying nonstop from Washington, D.C. to San Francisco. A person sits next to you.	VIII. You are on an airplane flying nonstop from Washington, D.C. to San Francisco. A person with a 5 year old child sits next to you.
IX. Friends from out of town are staying with you for a week.	IX. Friends from out of town are staying with you for a week. They bring their two preschool children.
X. A new family moves into your neighborhood.	X. A new family with several small children moves into your neighborhood.